

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Worcester,

ss.

May 20,

1964

Then personally appeared the above named Orvo O. Mack and Wilma C. Mack

and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be their free act and deed, before me

Morris N. Gould
Notary Public

My commission expires November 14, 1968

Recorded May 21, 1964 at 10h. 58m. A. M.

END OF INSTRUMENT

BOARD OF APPEALS

TOWN OF MENDON

Dorothy S. Manton, Administrator,
Estate of May E. Brown, Petitioner

Petition for Variance to divide
existing parcel on Maple Street
into non-conforming lots.

DECISION OF THE BOARD OF APPEALS

A public hearing was held at 7:00 P.M. Wednesday, February 26,
1964, in the Record Room, Main Street, Mendon. Board Members,
Richard C. Varney, H. William Thatcher, and alternate member, Arthur
F. Johnson, heard the appeal. Petitioner spoke in favor, no one
appeared in opposition to the granting of the petition.

BY UNANIMOUS VOTE, A VARIANCE IS GRANTED

The Board finds that the subject premises are now as they have
been for over 100 years. The parcel to be divided has a frontage on
Maple Street of 189.37 feet and an area of about 21,056 sq. ft. There
are 2 existing dwellings on the parcel predating our Zoning By-Law,
and predating any memory of those present at the hearing. The 2
existing dwellings are so situate on the parcel that there can be
no even division of the land. Petitioner proposes to fix a dividing
line between the two dwellings so that one lot would have a frontage
of 139 feet and an area of 13,890 sq. ft; the other lot would have
a frontage of 50.37 ft. and an area of 6,865 sq. ft. It is also
proposed that a third strip of land with an area of 301 sq. ft. on
the northwesterly corner of the subject premises be sold to an abutter
to make the abutting lot more nearly conforming. The Board finds
that the proposed division is a reasonable one and that the only
change requested or intended are the creation of new property lines
to conveniently separate title to the subject premises. The Board
finds that to deny this petition would create a hardship on the heirs
of the estate in that the petitioner, or the heirs, have no present
or expected use for both dwellings and the asset of at least one of
the dwellings would depreciate or be entirely lost in their hands.

One of the purposes of our Zoning By-Law is to preserve the
integrity of existing properties and to prevent avoidable blight and
decay in the future. We find that under the conditions existing in
the area of the subject premises the proposal of the petitioner
is an orderly solution to the property line problems. The
Variance is therefore granted.

Richard C. Varney

Mendon

Arthur F. Johnson

Board of

Appeals

H. William Thatcher

Recorded May 21, 1964 at 11h. 22m. A. M.

See Plan
Book 280,
Plan 86.